

PUPT-1341
September 1992

Conformal Turbulence

A. POLYAKOV[★]

*Joseph Henry Laboratories
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544*

ABSTRACT

We describe conformal field theories, correlation functions of which satisfy equations of the two-dimensional fluid mechanics. Prediction for the energy spectrum is given, $E(k) \sim k^{-25/7}$.

[★] Supported by NSF Grant PHY90-21984

In this letter I will discuss the turbulent solutions of the equations of the two-dimensional fluid dynamics. The term “turbulent solution” means here that we will be dealing with the correlation functions of velocities, vorticities, etc. instead of these quantities themselves. Therefore, the implicit assumption in this paper is that in the turbulent flow we have some well defined stationary probability distribution with respect to which these correlation functions are defined.

It is well known that, in this context, the Navier-Stokes equations lead to the chain of relations, expressing N-point function in terms of N+1 point functions. The standard approach to the theory of turbulence is to use some closure hypothesis in order to get concrete equations for the correlators (see [1] for a review).

Here we take a completely different route. We will try to satisfy the above mentioned chain of relations exactly by borrowing sets of correlation functions, known in the conformal field theory [2]. As a result we obtain a certain number of exact solutions for the two-dimensional turbulence.

The basic equations, to be solved, are very simple. We have vorticity ω as our basic fluctuating variable. Navier-Stokes equations have the form:

$$\dot{\omega} + e_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\alpha \psi \partial_\beta \partial^2 \psi = \nu \partial^2 \omega \quad (1)$$

(Here $\partial_\alpha = \partial/\partial x_\alpha$; $\partial^2 = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_\lambda^2}$. ψ is a stream function related to vorticity by $\omega = \partial^2 \psi$ and to velocity by

$$v_\alpha = e_{\alpha\beta} \partial_\beta \psi$$

ν is viscosity.) Now the correlation functions of the type

$$\langle \omega(\vec{x}_1) \cdots \omega(\vec{x}_N) \rangle$$

must be time independent, which gives:

$$< \dot{\omega}(\vec{x}_1)\omega(\vec{x}_2)\cdots > + < \omega(\vec{x}_1)\dot{\omega}(\vec{x}_2)\cdots > + \cdots = 0 \quad (2)$$

It is understood in (2) that we should express $\dot{\omega}$ through ψ via eq.(1). This obvious equation (when being written for the generating functionals) is called Hopf equation [1]. It expresses the fact that the probability distribution of our system commutes with the equations of motion. Since in turbulence we are dealing with the large Reynolds numbers, the viscous term in (1) can be neglected. It plays the role of the ultraviolet cutoff for the theory and will be discussed later.

Let us now present the simplest theory, which satisfies inviscid Hopf equation (2). Take the minimal model (2, 5) of conformal field theory (see [2] for the definitions). In this case we have two primary fields — the unit operator I and the field with the complex dimension $(-1/5, -1/5)$, which we will identify with ψ . The two point function of ψ in the conformal theory is:

$$< \psi(\vec{x})\psi(0) > = -|\vec{x}|^{4/5} \quad (3)$$

We shall postulate that, in order to get physical correlation function from the conformal one, we have to consider momentum representation of (3):

$$< \psi(\vec{k})\psi(-\vec{k}) > = \frac{\text{const}}{|\vec{k}|^{2+4/5}} \quad (4)$$

and to transform it back by cutting off the k -integral at some infrared point, defined by the large scales, $k_{min} \sim 1/r$. This would give:

$$< \psi(\vec{x})\psi(0) > = \text{const}[R^{4/5} - |\vec{x}|^{4/5}]. \quad (5)$$

We will have in mind similar rule for all cases, namely that the momentum space correlation functions

$$< \psi(\vec{k}_1)\cdots\psi(\vec{k}_N) >$$

for $|\vec{k}_j| \gg 1/R$ are R -independent, while in the coordinate space one should include contributions from the infrared corners. Thus defined, physical correlators

differ from the conformal ones by the terms, analytic in $\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_j$. It should also be understood that conformal expressions are valid only if

$$|\vec{k}| < k_{max} \sim 1/a$$

The ultraviolet cutoff a is determined by the viscosity. The presence of the UV cutoff means that we should use careful point-splitting procedure when defining the products of operators. In particular the product in the LHS of (1) should be understood as:

$$e_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\psi(\vec{x})\partial_\beta\partial^2\psi(\vec{x}) = \overline{\lim}_{a \rightarrow 0} e_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\psi(\vec{x} + \vec{a}/2)\partial_\beta\partial^2\psi(\vec{x} - \vec{a}/2) \quad (6)$$

(where $\overline{\lim}$ means directional averaging). In order to evaluate the RHS of (6) we have to use operator product expansion, which, for our case, can be written symbolically as

$$[\psi] \times [\psi] = [I] + [\psi]$$

where $[\psi]$ means conformal class of ψ , i.e. itself together with the operators

$$L_{-n_1}L_{-n_2}\cdots L_{-n_k}\psi,$$

L_{-n} being Virasoro generators [2]. More explicitly:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(\vec{x} + \vec{a}/2)\psi(\vec{x} - \vec{a}/2) &= |a|^{4/5}(I + C_1a^2L_{-2}I + \cdots) \\ &+ |a|^{2/5}(\psi + C_2aL_{-1}\psi + a^2(C_3L_{-2} + C_4L_{-1}^2\psi + \cdots) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Performing differentiation of the LHS, we find the leading term:

$$e_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\psi\partial_\beta\partial^2\psi = \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} const|a|^{2/5}(L_{-2}\bar{L}_{-1}^2 - \bar{L}_{-2}L_{-1}^2)\psi \quad (8)$$

Antisymmetry of the RHS under complex conjugation is, of course, just the consequence of the ϵ -tensor at the LHS. If we rescale

$$\psi \Rightarrow |a|^{2/5}\psi \quad (9)$$

requiring fixed values of velocity at the scale a , the a -dependence of the RHS disappears. It is now quite easy to see, that actually RHS of (8) is equal to zero.

This happens, because in the (2, 5) model, the field ψ is degenerate on the second level, satisfying:

$$(L_{-2} - 5/2 L_{-1}^2)\psi = 0 \quad (10)$$

Then, because of antisymmetry we get:

$$\dot{\omega} = -e_{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\psi\partial_\beta\partial^2\psi = 0$$

and the Hopf equation is formally satisfied. The only thing to check is that this result is not spoiled by the analytic terms, coming from the infrared contributions, mentioned above. Indeed, we dealt with the strictly conformal theory, disregarding these terms. In order to check this let us look at the expression for the operator (8) inserted into some correlation function in the momentum space. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \dot{\omega}(q)\psi(f_1)\cdots\psi(f_N) \rangle &= \int d^2k [k, q](k^2 - (q - k)^2) \\ &\times \langle \psi(k)\psi(q - k)\psi(f_1)\cdots\psi(f_N) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The dangerous region is $k \rightarrow 0$. By using operator products once again it is easy to see that:

$$\langle \psi(k)\psi(q - k)\psi(f_1)\cdots \rangle \underset{k \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{1}{|k|^{2+4/5}} \quad (12)$$

and hence there is no infrared divergence in general.

Let us estimate the region in which our solution works. First of all we compare kinematical time at the scale r :

$$\frac{1}{t(r)} \sim \frac{v(r)}{r} \sim \psi(r)/r^2 \quad (13)$$

with the relaxation time:

$$\frac{1}{\tau(r)} \sim \frac{\dot{\psi}(r)}{\psi(r)} \quad (14)$$

Using the fact that

$$\psi(r) \sim \psi(a) \left(\frac{r}{a}\right)^{2/5}$$

and eq. (1) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\tau(r)} = \frac{\psi(a)a^2}{r^2} \cdot 1/r^2 \quad (15)$$

On the other hand, our neglect of the viscosity is justified if

$$\frac{1}{t(r)} > \nu/r^2 ; \quad \frac{\psi(r)}{\nu} > 1 \quad (16)$$

And hence

$$a \sim R \cdot (\text{Reynolds number})^{-5/2} \quad (17)$$

It should be realized that the solution we discussed is rather exotic. It breaks parity, since the stream functions are pseudoscalars and hence can exist only in the systems with net rotations or magnetic fields. Another unusual feature, which we will discuss now is the fact that as $\nu \rightarrow 0$ the fluxes of energy and enstrophy vanish. This regime requires a subtle balance between injected rotation, enstrophy and energy. Still it may be interesting as a first case in which the Hopf equations are exactly solved (apart from the trivial Gibbs distributions).

Viscosity and stirring forces should play the role of the boundary conditions for our solutions. At present we do not know any rigorous way to implement them, and will have to make some conjectures, which lead to more generic and physical solutions than the above.

The standard picture of turbulence involves Kolmogorov's idea of constant fluxes. According to Kraichnan [3], in two dimensions the relevant flux is the flux of enstrophy. Perhaps the condition of constant flux is necessary for the matching of the perfect fluid solution with the viscous region. Let us try to formulate this

condition in our language. The enstrophy is a conserving quantity for the perfect fluid given by:

$$H = \int \omega^2(\bar{x}) d^2x \quad (18)$$

In order to study this quantity in the turbulent regime it is convenient to introduce the point-split definition (6) (which actually has been exploited already by Kolmogorov in 1941) and to use the identity

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle \omega(x+r/2) \omega(x-r/2) \rangle = \frac{\partial}{\partial r_\alpha} \langle \omega(x+r/2) \omega(x-r/2) (v_\alpha(x+r/2) - v_\alpha(x-r/2)) \rangle \quad (19)$$

The constant r -independent enstrophy production will be reached if:

$$\langle \omega(x+r/2) \omega(x-r/2) (v_\alpha(x+r/2) - v_\alpha(x-r/2)) \rangle = Br_\alpha \quad (20)$$

This is a standard Kolmogorov-like relation. It has striking analogy with the axial (and other) anomalies in quantum field theory. Indeed, if one considers massless quantum electrodynamics, and define the axial current as

$$J_{\mu 5}(x) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \langle \bar{\psi}(x+r/2) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi(x-r/2) \rangle \quad (21)$$

the Dirac equation readily gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu J_{\mu 5}(x) &= \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} (A_\mu(x+r/2) - A_\mu(x-r/2)) \langle \bar{\psi}(x+r/2) \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \psi(x-r/2) \rangle \\ &= \text{const} \int \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\rho} \partial_\mu A_\nu \partial_\lambda A_\rho d^4x \neq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Physically, chiral charge is produced at the cut-off momenta and transferred through the momentum space into the physical region. In Kolmogorov's case the same happens with enstrophy or with energy.

While eq. (20) is very nice, the next standard step looks quite appalling to a field theorist. Namely, one concludes from (20) that dimensionality in this formula

can be counted as a simple sum of dimensions of $\omega \sim v/r$ and v thus giving $v \sim r$. The problem here is that in the field theory dimensions are not additive and, when we take an operator product, we get at the right-hand side some defect of dimensions.

We will attempt here to formulate constant flux condition field-theoretically. Let us consider some conformal field theory with the fusion rule:

$$[\psi] \times [\psi] = [\phi] + \dots \quad (23)$$

As was argued above we have

$$\dot{\omega} \sim (L_{-2}\bar{L}_{-1}^2 - \bar{L}_{-2}L_{-1}^2)\phi \quad (24)$$

Now, if we rewrite eq. (19) in the form:

$$< \dot{\omega}(x+r)\omega(x) > = r^o$$

we obtain (recalling that $\omega = \partial^2\psi$):

$$(\Delta_\phi + 2) + (\Delta_\psi + 1) = 0 \quad (25)$$

$$\Delta_\phi + \Delta_\psi = -3$$

If dimensions had been additive $\Delta_\phi = 2\Delta_\psi$ (which is not the case of course) we would have obtained Kolmogorov-Kraichnan result $\Delta_\psi = -1$. We do not insist now on the especially slow relaxation, by requiring, as we did in our first example, that ϕ is level two degenerate. Instead, we need the condition

$$\Delta_\phi > 2\Delta_\psi \quad (26)$$

which simply means that RHS of (23) vanishes as $a \rightarrow 0$. In this case we get

inequality

$$\Delta_\psi < -1 \tag{27}$$

which means that the energy spectrum, given by

$$E(k) \sim k^{4\Delta_\psi+1}$$

is steeper than in Kraichan-Kolmogorov approximation

$$E(k) \sim k^{-3}.$$

Of course, it should be remembered when implementing (24) that non-zero contribution there comes from the regular (infrared) term, while the conformal term is zero, due to orthogonality between the primary operators. This is just as well, because otherwise logarithmic terms could be expected. Also, the conformal part of the theory is invariant under time reflection, while the correlator (24) breaks it due to “infrared leakage” of time asymmetry.

I do not have complete classification of conformal theories, satisfying above requirement. There exist an appealing example, however. Let us consider minimal models of the type $(2, 2N+1)$. From our general classification [2] it follows that in this case we have a set of N primary fields,

$$\psi_1, \psi_2, \dots \psi_N$$

with dimensions:

$$-\Delta_s = \frac{(2N-s)(s-1)}{2(2N+1)} \tag{29}$$

and the algebra:

$$[\psi_x] \times [\psi_s] = [\psi_{2s-1}] + [\psi_{2s-3}] + \dots \tag{30}$$

for $2s-1 \leq N$, and with replacement $s \Rightarrow 2N+1-s$ otherwise.

Constant flux condition (25) takes the form:

$$\Delta_s + \Delta_{2s-1} = -3 \quad (31)$$

Solution to this Diofantian equation is $s = 4$ and $N = 10$ for which case

$$\Delta_\psi = \Delta_4 = -8/7; \Delta_\phi = \Delta_7 = -\frac{13}{7} \quad (32)$$

The energy spectrum for this case is

$$E(k) \sim 1/k^{3+4/7} \quad (33)$$

The experimental value of this exponent seems to lie between 3 and 4. Also, this solution preserves parity, because there is no ψ -operator in the product $\psi \times \psi$, and more generally we have symmetry under parity reflection:

$$\psi_s \rightarrow (-1)^{s+1} \psi_s \quad (34)$$

There could be other solutions of these requirements. The major difficulty of our approach is the somewhat heuristic treatment of the analytic contributions. We need to supplement conformal field theory with more definite rules for their contributions. Before that, our analyses of the basic equations is not complete for large enough negative Δ (our first example with $\Delta = -1/5$ seems to be immune to this problem). Probably, one possible approach is to perturb conformal theory away from criticality and create a small mass gap which will provide IR-cutoff. This is left for future work.

The whole picture looks as following. There are many formal solutions of the inviscid Hopf equations. Some of these solutions (for which ϕ is level two degenerate) are more stable than the others. However, only one or very few solutions satisfy right boundary conditions (in the momentum space) needed to match them with the viscous region. All that is very much like the situation for the laminar flows, where one needs boundary layer consideration in order to determine the correct inviscid solution.

Another view on the same problem is the use of Lagrangian coordinates for the fluid. In this formulation there is some similarity to string theory which might be useful. Namely, it is easy to see that if we describe the fluid by the fluid coordinate

$$x_A(\xi_1, \xi_2; t) \quad A = 1, 2$$

$$x_A(\xi, 0) = \xi_A \tag{35}$$

$$\dot{x}_A(\xi, t) = v_A(x(\xi, t), t)$$

There exist a convenient action for the incompressible fluid (in any dimensions):

$$S = \frac{1}{2} \int dt d^D \xi \dot{x}^2(\xi, t) + \int p(\xi t) [\det(\frac{\partial x_A}{\partial \xi_\alpha}) - 1] d^2 \xi dt \tag{36}$$

where p is the Lagrange multiplier.

This action has invariance under volume preserving diffeomorphisms, and should be treated in a stringy way, by introducing ghosts, auxilliary metric etc. Perhaps in the steady state (for D=2) we have some effective string theory describing correlations of $x - s$ or, better to say, of the “vertex operators”:

$$v_A(x) = \int \dot{x}_A(\xi) \delta(x - x(\xi)) d^2 \xi$$

Finally, there are many obvious generalizations of the above approach, like including compressibility, magnetic fields, passive scalars etc.

I am grateful to E. Siggia, V. Yakhot and A. Zamolodchikov for useful discussions. I am also pleased to thank Kurt Gottfried and Andre LeClair for their kind hospitality at Cornell University, and for providing nice weather, which helped to complete this work.

References

- [1] Monin, A.S. and Yaglom, A.M., “Statistical Fluid Mechanics,” MIT Press, Cambridge (1975).
- [2] Belavin, A., Polyakov, A. and Zamolodchikov, A., *Nucl. Phys.* **B241**, 33 (1984).
- [3] Kraichnan, R., *Phys. of Fluids* **10**, 1417 (1967).